OIPE JC169 AUG 18 2005 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Attorney Docket: YOR920000401US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): Drissi et al.
Docket No.: YOR920000401US1
Serial No.: 09/713,342
Filing Date: November 14, 2000
Group: 2121
Examiner: Wilbert L. Starks

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature: _____ Date: August 16, 2005

Title: Method and Apparatus for Generating a Data Classification Model Using an Adaptive Learning Algorithm

---

TRANSMITTAL OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith are the following documents relating to the above-identified patent application:

1. Request to Reinstate Appeal; and
2. Supplemental Appeal Brief.

In the event of non-payment or improper payment of a required fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or to credit **IBM Corporation's Deposit Account No. 50-0510** as required to correct the error. A duplicate copy of this letter is enclosed.

Respectfully,

Date: August 16, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s): Drissi et al.
Docket No.: YOR920000401US1
Serial No.: 09/713,342
Filing Date: November 14, 2000
Group: 2121
Examiner: Wilbert L. Starks

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature: _____ Date: August 16, 2005

Title: Method and Apparatus for Generating a Data Classification Model Using an Adaptive Learning Algorithm

---

REQUEST TO REINSTATE APPEAL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants hereby request to reinstate the appeal. Applicants' Corrected Appeal Brief was submitted on February 17, 2005. A new Office Action was mailed on May 19, 2005.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,

Date: August 16, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent Application

Applicant(s):	Drissi et al.
Docket No.:	YOR920000401US1
Serial No.:	09/713,342
Filing Date:	November 14, 2000
Group:	2129
Examiner:	Wilbert L. Starks

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited on this date with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Signature: Gina Mauriello Date: August 16, 2005

Title: Method and Apparatus for Generating a Data Classification Model Using an Adaptive Learning Algorithm

---

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellants hereby reply to the non-final Office Action, mailed May 19, 2005. A request to reinstate the appeal is submitted herewith. Appellants' Corrected Appeal Brief in an Appeal of the final rejection of claims 1 through 23 in the above-identified patent application was submitted on February 17, 2005.

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the present appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

The present application was filed on November 14, 2000 with claims 1 through 23. A Corrected Appeal Brief was submitted on February 17, 2005, and prosecution was re-opened in the non-final Office Action dated May 19, 2005. Claims 1 through 23 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 8, 13, 16, and 21-23 are independent claims.

Claims 1-23 remain rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 13-19, and 21-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McAulay, A.D. and Oh, J.C., Improved Learning in Genetic Rule-Based Classifier Systems, Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 1991; Decision Aiding for Complex Systems, Conference Proceedings, 1991 IEEE International Conference, October 13-16, 1991, Pages 1393-1398, Vol. 2 (hereinafter McAulay), and claims 5-7, 10-12, and 20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McAulay et al. in view of Lewis, David D., An Evaluation of Phrasal and Clustered Representations on a Text Categorization Task, Proceeding of the Fifteenth Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, June 1992, pages 37-50 (hereinafter Lewis).

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

A statement identifying the status of the amendments is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

A Summary of the Invention is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief.

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A statement identifying the original grounds of rejection is contained in Appellants' Appeal Brief. Claims 1 through 23 are pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-23 are now rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 13-19, and 21-23 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McAulay, and claims 5-7, 10-12, and 20 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McAulay in view of Lewis.

CLAIMS APPEALED

A copy of the appealed claims is contained in an Appendix of Appellants' Appeal Brief.

ARGUMENTS

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 1-23 were rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Examiner asserts that claims 1, 8, 13, 16, and 21-23 are not claimed to be practiced on a computer and that it is clear that these claims are not limited to practice in the technological arts. The Examiner further asserts that none of the claims are limited to practical applications in the technological arts, that Applicants fail to define a useful, concrete and tangible result, and do not specify the associated practical application with the appropriate level of specificity. The Examiner also finds that the Applicants manipulated a set of abstract "input data" to solve mathematical problems in the abstract and that the result of such manipulations is not statutory. Regarding the "system" and "computer readable medium" recitals in claims 16-23, the Examiner asserts that the invention is still found to be non-statutory.

Under Section 101, "any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter" is patentable. 35 U.S.C. §101. It is recognized, however, that despite the broad scope of section 101, "laws of nature, physical phenomena and abstract ideas" cannot be patented. *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303, 309, 206 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 193, 197 (1980).

The Examiner asserts that claims 1-23 are not claimed to be practiced on a computer and that it is clear that these claims are not limited to practice in the technological arts. To the contrary, however, each of the independent claims are expressly directed to a practical method of (or system for) "classifying data." For example, the method can be used to classify real numerical vectors. Thus, each of these claims are clearly tied to a practical application. A process that is limited to a practical application of an abstract idea or mathematical algorithm in the technological arts is patentable. *See* Examination Guidelines for Computer-Related Inventions, Section IV. B. 2. b. (ii).

Argument 1

In the Office Action dated May 19, 2005, the Examiner asserts that Applicants have admitted that the invention is an algorithm operating on purely unspecified variables, and have admitted the very elements that trigger the application of the Warmerdam standard (i.e., the pure algorithmic manipulation of abstractions).

Appellants note that, in the text cited by the Examiner, it was simply stated that the method(s) of the present invention can be used to ***classify real numerical vectors*** and, thus, each of the claims are clearly ***tied to a practical application***. Appellants also acknowledge the fact that, ***in general***, a process that is limited to a practical application of an abstract idea or mathematical algorithm in the technological arts is patentable. Appellants, however, could not find any of the admissions as cited by the Examiner.

In any event, the analysis does not stop there. The Supreme Court has stated that the "***[t]ransformation*** and reduction of an article 'to a different state or thing' is the clue to patentability of a process claim." *Gottshalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70, 175 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 676 (1972). In other words, claims that require some kind of transformation of subject matter, which has been held to include intangible subject matter, such as data or signals that are representative of or constitute physical activity or objects, have been held to comply with Section 101. *See, for example, In re Warmerdam,* 31 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1754, 1759 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 1994) or *In re Schrader*, 22 F.3d 290, 295, 30 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1455, 1459 n.12 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Each independent claim includes at least one transformation. For example, independent claims 1, 16 and 22 **modify** the bias of one or more data classification models, based on a performance evaluation. Thus, a modified data classification model is provided. Claims 8, 21 and 23 **classify** objects and **select** a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of the domain dataset to rules. Thus, an object classification is provided. Finally, claim 13 processes performance values for each combination of domain dataset and said bias to **adjust** one or more rules for subsequent data classification. Thus, adjusted rules are provided.

Arguments 2 and 3

In the Office Action dated May 19, 2005, the Examiner asserts that there are no limitations in the claims to show that they are drawn to include the transformation of data or signals that are representative of or constitute physical activity or objects.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the modified data classification model, object classification, and adjusted rules, cited above are the result of the transformation of subject matter, which has been held to include intangible subject matter, such as data or signals that are representative of or constitute physical activity or objects.

Appellants submit that each of the claims 1-23 are therefore in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §101, and accordingly, respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 1, 8, 13, 16 and 21-23

Independent claims 1, 8, 13, 16, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McAulay. Regarding claims 8, 21, and 23, the Examiner asserts that McAulay teaches selecting a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules (FIG. 1: lines 4-5 and 10-11).

In the Office Action dated June 22, 2004, the Examiner acknowledged that McAulay does not disclose selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set (see, rejection of claim 1), but asserted that Lewis shows a classifier using meta-features. In the present

Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by McAulay, but fails to address the issue cited above, namely, that McAulay does not disclose selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set.

Argument 4

In the Office Action dated May 19, 2005, the Examiner asserts that Applicant has not provided a limitation to the word "domain" and has not shown why unspecified "data sets" cannot include features of indexing terms.

First, Appellants note that Lewis was not cited in the current rejection of claim 1. Appellants also note that the present disclosure teaches that

> the domain dataset 300 contains a record for each object and indicates the class associated with each object. The domain dataset 300 maintains a plurality of records, such as records 305 through 320, each associated with a different object. For each object, *the domain dataset 300 indicates a number of features in fields 350 through 365, describing each* ***object*** *in the dataset.* The last field 370 corresponds to the class assigned to each object. For example, if the domain dataset 300 were to correspond to astronomical images to be classified as either stars or galaxies, then each record 305-320 would correspond to a different object in the image, and each field 350-365 would correspond to a different feature such as the amount of luminosity, shape or size. The class field 370 would be populated with the label of "star" or "galaxy."
> (Page 8, lines 1-10; emphasis added.)

The IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms, Sixth Edition, defines a data set as "a named collection of related records," and defines "domain" as "(A) the set of all possible values that can be taken on by an independent variable. (B) In a relational data model, the set of all possible values that can be taken on by some attribute." Thus, a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the features of indexing terms taught by Lewis are ***not*** domain data sets. Also, since neither McAulay nor Lewis disclose or suggest that features of indexing terms are domain datasets, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not look to combine McAulay and Lewis.

Also, as previously argued, Appellants note that Lewis teaches that "most current indexing languages represent documents as tuples or vectors of numeric or binary

values, with *each value corresponding to an indexing term.*" (Page 38, Section 2.) Lewis then teaches that, "for clarity, we therefore call the features of indexing terms metafeatures." (Page 38, Section 2.2). *Metafeatures in Lewis are therefore features of indexing terms* (the individual values representing a document) and not domain datasets.

More importantly, Lewis does not disclose selecting data classification models based on a *meta-feature that characterizes a domain data set.* In addition, since Lewis only discloses the use of one algorithm (the genetic algorithm), there is no *selection of classification models.* Independent claims 1, 16, and 22 require classifying objects in a domain dataset using one or more data classification models, each of said one or more data classification models having a bias; selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set; evaluating the performance of said classifying step; and modifying said bias based on said performance evaluation. Independent claim 13 requires applying an adaptive learning algorithm to said domain dataset to select a data classification model based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set, said data classification model having a bias; classifying objects in said domain dataset using said selected data classification model; evaluating the performance of said classifying step; maintaining an indication of said performance of said model for said domain dataset; repeating said applying, classifying and evaluating steps for a plurality of said domain datasets; and processing said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to adjust one or more rules for subsequent data classification, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models. Independent claim 8, 21, and 23 require classifying objects in a plurality of domain datasets using one of a number of data classification models, each of said data classification models having a corresponding bias; evaluating the performance of each of said domain dataset classifications; maintaining a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias; processing said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models; and selecting a data classification

model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

Thus, McAulay et al. or Lewis, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest classifying objects in a domain dataset using one or more data classification models, each of said one or more data classification models having a bias; selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set; evaluating the performance of said classifying step; and modifying said bias based on said performance evaluation, as required by independent claims 1, 16, and 22, do not disclose or suggest applying an adaptive learning algorithm to said domain dataset to select a data classification model based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set, said data classification model having a bias; classifying objects in said domain dataset using said selected data classification model; evaluating the performance of said classifying step; maintaining an indication of said performance of said model for said domain dataset; repeating said applying, classifying and evaluating steps for a plurality of said domain datasets; and processing said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to adjust one or more rules for subsequent data classification, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models, as required by independent claim 13, and do not disclose or suggest classifying objects in a plurality of domain datasets using one of a number of data classification models, each of said data classification models having a corresponding bias; evaluating the performance of each of said domain dataset classifications; maintaining a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias; processing said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models; and selecting a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules, as required by independent claims 8, 21, and 23.

Argument 5

In the Office Action dated May 19, 2005, the Examiner asserts that Applicant's argument is a run-on conclusory statement that does not specify any feature that is claimed by Applicant that does not appear in the prior art, and that it is a stringing together of the features of several claims.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the above citation recites, for each claim, the one or more limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The assertion that the citation is "a stringing together of the features of several claims" unfairly suggests that limitations from *different claims* were strung together to represent one claim.

Claims 3 and 18

Claims 3 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McAulay et al. in view of Lewis. The Examiner asserts that the limitation of claim 3 is taught by McAulay (FIG. 1: lines 4-5) and, in Argument 6, asserts that rules are generated in the system (top of the second column on page 1393) and that a bias is inherent to a classification system. Appellants note, however, that McAulay does not disclose or suggest generating one or more rules, *each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models.*

Thus, McAulay et al. or Lewis, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest generating one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models, as required by dependent claims 3 and 18.

Claims 4 and 19

Claims 4 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over McAulay et al. in view of Lewis. The Examiner asserts that the limitation of claim 4 is taught by McAulay (Page 1393, third paragraph, first three lines of the paragraph). In Argument 7, the Examiner again asserts that rules are generated in the system and that "the prior art is Genetic...that is, natural Selection." Applicants note, however, that McAulay does not disclose or suggest the step of selecting a data classification model for ***classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of***

said domain dataset to said rules.

Thus, McAulay et al. or Lewis, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the step of selecting a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules, as required by dependent claims 4 and 19.

Conclusion

The rejections of the cited claims under §102 and §103 in view of McAulay et al. or Lewis, alone or in any combination, are therefore believed to be improper and should be withdrawn. The remaining rejected dependent claims are believed allowable for at least the reasons identified above with respect to the independent claims.

The attention of the Examiner and the Appeal Board to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,

Date: August 16, 2005

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560

APPENDIX

1. A method for classifying data, comprising the steps of:

classifying objects in a domain dataset using one or more data classification models, each of said one or more data classification models having a bias;

selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set;

evaluating the performance of said classifying step; and

modifying said bias based on said performance evaluation.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said steps of classifying and evaluating are performed for a plurality of said domain datasets and wherein said method further comprising the steps of recording a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias.

3. The method of claim 2, further comprising the step of processing said recorded performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models.

4. The method of claim 3, further comprising the step of selecting a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

5. The method of claim 1, wherein said domain dataset is represented using a set of meta-features.

6. The method of claim 5, wherein said meta-features includes a concept variation meta-feature.

7. The method of claim 5, wherein said meta-features includes an average weighted distance meta-feature that measures the density of the distribution of said at least one domain dataset.

8. A method for classifying data, comprising the steps of:

classifying objects in a plurality of domain datasets using one of a number of data classification models, each of said data classification models having a corresponding bias;

evaluating the performance of each of said domain dataset classifications;

maintaining a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias;

processing said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models; and

selecting a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

9. The method of claim 8, further comprising the step of modifying at least one of said biases based on said performance evaluation.

10. The method of claim 8, wherein said domain dataset is represented using a set of meta-features.

11. The method of claim 10, wherein said meta-features includes a concept variation meta-feature.

12. The method of claim 10, wherein said meta-features includes an average weighted distance meta-feature that measures the density of the distribution of said at least one domain dataset.

13. A method for classifying data in a domain dataset, comprising:

applying an adaptive learning algorithm to said domain dataset to select a data classification model based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set, said data classification model having a bias;

classifying objects in said domain dataset using said selected data classification model;

evaluating the performance of said classifying step;

maintaining an indication of said performance of said model for said domain dataset;

repeating said applying, classifying and evaluating steps for a plurality of said domain datasets; and

processing said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to adjust one or more rules for subsequent data classification, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models.

14. The method of claim 13, further comprising the step of selecting a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

15. The method of claim 13, further comprising the step of modifying at least one of said biases based on said performance evaluation.

16. A system for classifying data, comprising:

a memory that stores computer-readable code; and

a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said processor configured to implement said computer-readable code, said computer-readable code configured to:

classify objects in a domain dataset using ~~a~~ one or more data classification models, each of said one or more data classification models having a bias;

selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set;

evaluate the performance of said classifying step; and

modify said bias based on said performance evaluation.

17. The system of claim 16, wherein said processor is further configured to classify said objects and evaluate said performance for a plurality of said domain datasets and wherein said processor records a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias.

18. The system of claim 17, wherein said processor is further configured to process said recorded performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models.

19. The system of claim 18, wherein said processor is further configured to select a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

20. The system of claim 16, wherein said domain dataset is represented using a set of meta-features.

21. A system for classifying data, comprising:

a memory that stores computer-readable code; and

a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said processor configured to implement said computer-readable code, said computer-readable code configured to:

classify objects in a plurality of domain datasets using one of a number of data classification models, each of said data classification models having a corresponding bias;

evaluate the performance of each of said domain dataset classifications;

maintaining a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias;

process said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models; and

select a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

22. An article of manufacture for classifying data, comprising:

a computer readable medium having computer readable code means embodied thereon, said computer readable program code means comprising:

a step to classify objects in a domain dataset using ~~a~~ one or more data classification models, each of said one or more data classification models having a bias;

selecting at least one of said one or more data classification models based on a meta-feature that characterizes said domain data set;

a step to evaluate the performance of said classifying step; and

a step to modify said bias based on said performance evaluation.

23. An article of manufacture for classifying data, comprising:

a computer readable medium having computer readable code means embodied thereon, said computer readable program code means comprising:

a step to classify objects in a plurality of domain datasets using one of a number of data classification models, each of said data classification models having a corresponding bias;

a step to evaluate the performance of each of said domain dataset classifications;

a step to maintaining a performance value for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias;

a step to process said performance values for each combination of said domain datasets and said bias to generate one or more rules, each of said rules specifying one or more characteristics of said domain datasets and a corresponding bias that should be utilized in one of said data classification models; and

a step to select a data classification model for classifying a domain dataset by comparing characteristics of said domain dataset to said rules.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

There is no evidence submitted pursuant to § 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by the Examiner and relied upon by appellant.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

There are no known decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of 37 CFR 41.37.